

representative Donald Jackson, denounced him on the floor of the House of Representatives, declaring, with characteristic taste and discretion, "Bishop Oxnham has been to the Communist front what Man O' War was to thoroughbred racing."

The bishop demanded a hearing by the committee and in a long, dramatic session which lasted all day and far into the night, made a point-by-point refutation of every item in the file and gave the committee a lesson in elementary Americanism. That hearing took place just 10 years ago and constituted, in a sense, the culmination of Bishop Oxnham's career. He served, on that occasion, as an eloquent witness to the Christian ideals of which his whole life was an exemplar.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 14, 1963]

BISHOP OXNAM DEAD—CHAMPION OF LIBERALISM

(By Kenneth Dole)

Bishop G. Bromley Oxnham retired Bishop of the Washington area of the Methodist Church and one of the Nation's outstanding religious leaders, died late Tuesday at the Burke Rehabilitation Foundation in White Plains, N.Y.

He had gone there to recover from an operation for Parkinson's disease. He was 71.

Bishop Oxnham, for many years a prominent figure in the religious world, having served as president of the Federal (now National) Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches, became a household name after his appearance before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1953.

He had been asked to answer charges, not only against him but against the body of liberal clergymen, of Communist sympathy suggested by membership in Communist-front organizations.

TESTIFIED 10 HOURS

For 10 hours on a sweltering July day, the bishop answered the committee's questions and made it plain that he and the other liberals had no truck with communism. "I am fundamentally opposed to the whole Communist movement," he declared.

On another day, he would say that the hope of the world is "love operating in freedom." Christianity, he said, "holds that love is the force that unites men." As a religion of love, Christianity needs freedom, he said. "It's under the condition of freedom that Christianity and the church have their greatest opportunity."

Under the committee's questioning, that covered periods going as far back as into the 1920's the bishop conceded that he had been associated at times with organizations later cited as being Communist controlled or inspired. But he made it clear that whenever he detected an indication of Communist influence, he got out.

CLEARED BY PROBERS

The hearing ended, after midnight, in a triumph; for the Committee unanimously voted "that the records of this Committee show that this Committee has no record of any Communist Party membership or affiliation of Bishop Oxnham."

During his Washington bishopric, from 1952 to 1960, Bishop and Mrs. Oxnham called upon all the 1,700 ministers in the Washington area; he served a period as president of the Methodist Council of Bishops, and he led in the development of Methodist institutions here.

Through his encouragement, support and prompting, American University made a great advance toward his vision of it as "a great Protestant institution in the Nation's Capital." The American University established its School of International Service, and Sibley Hospital moved into a new

building near the university to provide a nucleus for a medical center.

MOVED SEMINARY HERE

Dear to his heart was Westminster, Md., Theological Seminary, which he influenced, as chairman of the board of trustees, to move to Washington and create its present handsome campus at the northeast corner of American University. Its chapel, well known to Washingtonians for the figure of Christ on the Massachusetts avenue wall, was named after him.

The Bishop was one of the founders and a vice president of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

The son of a mining engineer, he was born at Sonora, Calif., and studied at the University of Southern California, Boston University, and Harvard. In college he played tennis in addition to football and won a Phi Beta Kappa key. He was ordained in 1916.

After a notable 10-year pastorate at the Church of All Nations, Los Angeles, he became professor of practical theology at Boston University, then president of DePaw University, Greencastle, Ind. In 1936 he was elected bishop of the Omaha area; in 1939, of the Boston area; in 1944, of the New York area; and in 1952, the Washington area.

LAUDED BY COLLEAGUE

He was succeeded here, in 1960, by Bishop John Wesley Lord, who said yesterday that "the whole religious community, both national and worldwide, has suffered an irreparable loss." Bishop Lord added that "it would be hard to name a great social movement within the Methodist Church during the years of his effective ministry that did not bear the imprint of his dynamic personality."

"Bishop Oxnham," said Bishop Lord, "was recognized by friends and foe alike as one of the 'summit souls' with whom God on occasion blesses mankind."

Besides his wife, the former Ruth Fisher, Bishop Oxnham leaves two sons, Robert F. Oxnham, president of Drew University, Madison, N.J., and Philip H. Oxnham, of Kenwood, N.Y.; a daughter, Mrs. Robert McCormack, of Scarsdale, where the Bishop and Mrs. Oxnham had lived the last 3 years, and eight grandchildren.

There will be a service for his immediate family today, and a memorial service later. Following cremation, his ashes will be buried at Mount Auburn Cemetery, Cambridge, Mass.

Meaningful Suggestions for Action Against Cuba Short of War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 11, 1963

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I reject the idea advanced by high administration officials that the only choice is to do nothing in regard to Cuba or to go to war. I believe there are a number of effective and positive alternatives. I believe further that the vast majority of Americans support these alternatives, because they know that regardless of whether there are "defensive" or "offensive" jet fighters and missiles in Cuba, it is a base for exporting of communism into the other American countries.

We cannot simply let the situation drift; all reports from our own Government and other American governments clearly show that Cuba is being used as a vast training ground for Communist agents. We need only to read the report by the Organization of American States, entitled "Subversion in the Western Hemisphere" to learn what is taking place. This report says hundreds of Latin American youths have attended Cuban training centers where they have received instructions not only in Marxist-Leninist theory, "but also in propaganda techniques, the use of arms and explosives, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, and so on."

There is danger from Cuba right now to the Governments and peoples of Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, Guatemala, and other nations. The leaders of the other American countries are far ahead of our own in seeking action against Castro. We simply cannot afford to wait until Castro's henchmen and their Kremlin-oriented brothers in arms have established themselves in Central or South America before we act.

I suggest that the following steps be given serious consideration. They are not especially original with me or with my party; they come from the Nation's responsible press, from the people, and from our friends in South and Central America who are looking and waiting for action.

Many of the following suggestions are related to the serious economic situation in Cuba and would frankly be intended to increase unrest by the people there due to the continued shortages of basic goods.

First. Close the Panama Canal to any ship trading with Cuba.

Second. Close all U.S. ports to any ship trading with Cuba.

Third. Use the pressure of cutting off foreign aid to countries whose ships trade with Cuba.

Fourth. Encourage concerted action through the Organization of American States to cut off all trade with Cuba in this hemisphere.

Fifth. Encourage OAS nations to act against Communist propaganda as recommended in the OAS report.

Sixth. Demand onsite inspection of missile sites and storage areas, the sixth of President Kennedy's requirements in his October 22, 1962, speech.

Seventh. Demand fair compensation for American property seized by Castro.

Eighth. Seize all Cuban assets in this country.

Ninth. Notify Castro that we will not permit any expansion of his form of dictatorship in this hemisphere.

Tenth. Furnish arms and training to Cubans in this country and other countries so they can aid other hemisphere governments in rejecting armed force used by Castro-trained guerrillas.

Eleventh. Recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile.

Twelfth. Demand that Russian troops leave Cuba.

Thirteenth. Reinstate the blockade or quarantine of Cuba.

The last two points are strongly supported by the American people, accord-

ing to pollster Samuel Lubell, writing in the Washington Star earlier this month. Points seven, eight, and nine were suggested by the President himself during the 1960 campaign.

Other suggestions could no doubt be added to this list, for there are many ways available to put pressure on a nation when it is desired to do so. But, to repeat, it is time to do something.

President Kennedy has pledged to act when the Communist revolution is exported from Cuba to the rest of the hemisphere. Is not the time for action now?

Two Federal Employees, James F. Deane and Jerome V. Bugnacki, Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, too often the valuable service rendered to our citizens by Federal employees goes unnoticed and unappreciated.

Last week, at the 11th annual awards luncheon sponsored by the Federal Business Association of Detroit, two men who have made outstanding contributions to their agencies and the general public were honored.

Named Outstanding Federal Administrator was Mr. James F. Deane. Federal Employee of the Year was Mr. Jerome V. Bugnacki.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the valuable service rendered by these two gentlemen and to thank them for their energy, enthusiasm, and imagination in serving the public.

OUTSTANDING FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE YEAR 1962: JAMES F. DEANE

Mr. James F. Deane, assistant district director, Detroit District of the Internal Revenue Service, started his Government service in 1934 as an office deputy with the Internal Revenue Service, which clerical position carried a CAF-4 grade. Within a few years he received a number of promotions and served in many administrative positions. With the reorganization of the Service in 1952, and the creation of the present Internal Revenue Service districts, James F. Deane was appointed to the position of assistant district director, as second in command of the Detroit district which covers the entire State of Michigan, with 1,800 employees in 35 offices collecting approximately \$7 billion of taxes each year.

During 1940, when the Federal Government was making preparations for war, the revisions in the tax laws made many people subject to tax who were previously exempt. The Internal Revenue Service underwent considerable change in its procedures; the number of employees increased rapidly. This trend has remained unchanged, with a major reorganization occurring in 1952. During this time James F. Deane was always under extreme pressure and was faced with seemingly insurmountable obstacles, coupled with an acute shortage of trained assistance. Although he consistently received "excellent"

efficiency ratings, more remarkable, however, is the fact that these ratings were received during a period when drastic changes were being made in the Internal Revenue Service. That he made the record which he did is ample proof of his flexibility, adaptability, ingenuity and overall ability.

A member of the Board of Directors of The Federal Business Association of Detroit for several years, being president of the Association during 1957; James F. Deane participated in the executive development program at Wayne University, and in May 1961 was named coordinator for the savings bond program for all-Federal agencies in the State of Michigan.

James F. Deane is active in church and civic affairs, is a member of Delta Sigma Pi Fraternity and graduated from the University of Detroit where he majored in accounting. Mr. Deane resides at 6361 Thorncrest Drive, Bloomfield Township, with his wife, Eleanor; their son, John Peter, is in the Jesuit Order.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR 1962: JEROME V. BUGNACKI

Mr. Jerome V. Bugnacki, customs inspector, was born in July 1918 and lived in Milwaukee, Wis., until he was 17, when he joined the (CCC) Civilian Conservation Corps. Four years later he enlisted in the Regular Army and while stationed at Fort Wayne married a Detroit girl, Lorraine Dubois.

Rapid advances in grade soon promoted Mr. Bugnacki to the rank of 1st sergeant. As an instructor in the Fifth Ranger Battalion, he participated in the Normandy invasion and the Battle of the Bulge and was severely wounded when a hand grenade exploded nearby, cost him the sight of his left eye. His courage had earned him the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster, a Presidential citation, and several medals and ribbons. Receiving an honorable discharge in March 1945, he returned to his home in Milwaukee for a short period prior to embarking on his new career in the Customs Service in May 1945.

While assigned as a customs inspector to the Detroit and Windsor Tunnel during 1959, Jerome Bugnacki uncovered the ring leaders of an organization that furnished undesirable aliens with documents to aid them in entering the United States. For his part in this case, Inspector Bugnacki received a Certificate of Commendation and a cash award from the Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service. "For his extraordinary detection of aliens inadmissible to the United States under the immigration laws." Again, while at the Ambassador Bridge, Inspector Bugnacki was successful in detecting a group of aliens who were working in the United States in violation of the immigration laws.

For the past year, Inspector Bugnacki has been assigned to the Ambassador Bridge Station where his capacity for producing quality work, for seeking work that must be done, and for the absorbing of details, has been observed by his supervisors. His personal efforts have contributed materially in establishing harmonious relations with those people who come into contact with customs and with his coworkers.

Although Inspector Bugnacki is very devoted to his work, and his performance is over and above that which is expected of him, he has been able to remain a real companion to his children, which relationship has evolved into a mutual admiration within his family. Jerome V. Bugnacki has six children, two sons and four daughters, all living at home, 2220 Calvin Street, Lincoln Park, Mich.

The Story of 10 Little Free Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Gulf States Utilities Co., an investor-owned electric utility company, has reprinted the following paraphrase of a well-known jingle. I am including it as a part of my remarks because it illustrates so clearly what can happen to the American people if we continue to allow the encroachment of the Federal Government into our lives, thus eroding our liberties.

These are the workers: Reddy Kilowatt, doctor, railroader, oil worker, steelworker, farmer, lawyer, grocer, salesclerk, reporter.

The article follows:

THE STORY OF 10 LITTLE FREE WORKERS
Ten little free workers in this country fine
and fair.
But if you cherish your freedom—worker
have a care.
Ten little free workers—Reddy was doing
fine
Until the Socialist got him—then there were
nine.
Nine little free workers laughed at Reddy's
fate
Along came Federal medicine—then there
were eight.
Eight little free workers thought this coun-
try heaven
But the government took over the railroads,
then there were seven.
Seven little free workers—till the oil work-
ers got in a fix
Uncle said oil's essential and took over, leav-
ing six.
Six little free workers till the day did ar-
rive
The steel mills too were federalized—then
there were five.
Five little free workers—but the farmers are
free no more
The farms have been collectivized—that
leaves only four.
Four little free workers till the Govern-
ment did decree
All must have free legal advice—then there
were three.
Three little free workers—the number is get-
ting few,
But with Government groceries selling
food—then there were two.
Two little free workers—our story's almost
done.
With clerks at work in Federal stores—that
leaves only one.
One little free worker—the reporter son-of-
a-gun
Mustn't criticize Government—so now there
are none.
Ten little free workers—but they are no
longer free
They work when and where ordered, and at
a fixed rate you see,
And it all could have been prevented if
they'd only seen fit to agree
And work together instead of saying "It
never can happen to me."

The committee said it "is sympathetic to the need to assist the economy of such friendly Western Hemisphere nations, and was gratified to find that Venezuela's economy has not suffered as a result of this Nation's oil import control program."

In fact, the hearings brought out that sales by Venezuela to the United States of all goods, but mostly petroleum, increased from \$892.3 million in 1958, the year before controls were imposed, to \$948.3 million in 1963.

4. The hearings brought out this anomaly: One the one hand, the Department of Interior tried to restrict the flow of foreign petroleum through the imposition of mandatory quotas. On the other hand, other departments of the Government (Department of Commerce's Bureau of International Trade) do the diametrically opposite and encourage the importation of petroleum into the United States.

5. The subcommittee has reason to believe that Canada is importing cheap oil, and, at the same time, exporting its high-price oil to the United States. Recognizing the importance of hemispheric solidarity and good relations with neighboring nations, the subcommittee added:

"It would be remiss in its obligation to the Congress not to report its findings that such practices are not conducive to the U.S. national interest and that ways and means must be found to correct such undesirable tendencies."

6. Excessive oil imports, particularly residuals, are destroying the capacity of the coal industry to produce and contribute its share to the Nation's economy and security. The coal industry cannot maintain its production in the face of continued loss of markets to excessive foreign fuels.

The Steed report added: "Some of the witnesses testified that in the event of war—tankers which bring oil from foreign lands to America would be extremely vulnerable to submarine attack."

"Should the United States become more and more dependent on foreign sources of supply, while neglecting the development of its own producing and refining capability, it would thereby greatly endanger its national existence."

"Not only would small and independent business be completely wiped out, but this could present an Achilles heel for the future." The subcommittee deems it of utmost importance that this does not happen."

Tribute to Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of U.S. House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1963, Lewis Deschler had served the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States 35 years as its Parliamentarian. On March 4, 1963, this House duly celebrated the event here in this Chamber, with the passage of a resolution—unanimously—that did Parliamentarian Deschler a high, appropriate and immensely deserved honor. This resolution—House Resolution 274—expressed the thanks and appreciation of the House for what the resolution called Parliamentarian Deschler's "wise and

impartial advice to the Speaker and Members" and for his "exceptional contribution to the operation of its rules."

This pertinent and official language in the resolution has very considerable implications and we in the House, especially those of us who have served here a long time, know precisely what the correct and meaningful phrases of the resolution mean. The words "wise" and "impartial" could hardly be improved upon and I can vouch for their precision because I, too, happen to have toiled in this Chamber since 1928, and I am fully aware that parliamentary impartiality and wisdom can be the lubricating medium that explains efficient and correct parliamentary practices. All this, as I have witnessed Mr. Deschler's service at close hand, attests to a judicial temperament, a punctilious dedication to the essential subtleties of orderly procedure, that again and again has won him, certainly from me, the highest order of respect and confidence.

What I would like to point out today is that Lew Deschler's service over these three and one-half decades has been a remarkable contribution as much to the country as to the several Speakers and the House Members who have served here, and who so constantly and exhaustively availed themselves of his talents and his knowledge. It is not enough to say that he enjoys an extraordinary mastery, as the tips of his fingers, of the infinite minutiae of parliamentary law. This happens to be his basic and—for this House—his indispensable tool, for the guidance that governs our tasks here. But over and above this knowledge and the immediacy of his judgment we recognize the quality of the man. This is an essentially inherited factor and all his own. It could not have been grafted onto his intellect from any of the good and distinguished schools he attended in Ohio or here in Washington.

In this quality of the man I emphasize especially the element of character, without which I doubt he could have maneuvered his way successfully among the strong and sometimes overwhelming personalities that again and again occupied this Chamber. He has a force of personality which is persuasive and decisive and restrained without being at all obtrusive, and which is never lacking in respect for the dignity of those who depend upon him for consultation, advice, judgment, and knowledge. He has again and again, almost constantly in the work-a-day affairs of this House, demonstrated a genius for understanding the political and personal problems of his distinguished clients, helping always, without abdicating by one jot or tittle the sacred precincts of his impartiality. He has been the diplomat extraordinary who, more than most diplomats, has always been clear and informative, and so diligently devoted to what is right and just, irrespective of rank or position, that the highest and the most powerful, as well as the humblest, have honored him for his integrity.

President Kennedy wrote to Parliamentarian Deschler emphasizing his "unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives."

Vice-President LYNDON B. JOHNSON has been quoted in this Chamber for his high opinion of Mr. Deschler, and, of course, the late Sam Rayburn, as we have been told, spoke of him as "a big brain man." To the encomiums of these very great leaders of our time, and to the excellent expressions of appreciation that have already been uttered in this Chamber, I add my own brief tribute to one of our mostly unsung heroes of the parliamentary system. For, Mr. Deschler and his performance is to the efficient operation of this House what grammar is to the correct employment of language—an indispensable discipline.

As a Member of Congress and as a citizen I extend to Lewis Deschler my compliments, my respect and my gratitude.

Churches and Other Charitable Institutions Not Tax Loopholes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune on March 11, 1963, entitled "Churches, Other Charitable Institutions Not Tax Loopholes."

The editorial follows:

CHURCHES, OTHER CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS NOT TAX LOOPHOLES

Is your church in Wisconsin Rapids, Ne-Koosa or Port Edwards a tax loophole?

Arrows of criticism aimed at President Kennedy's so-called tax reforms are zinging around the National Capital. Many of the pointed comments are hitting their targets.

The idea behind Kennedy's hoped-for \$13.6 billion in tax cuts spread over 3 years is to cause all of us to spend more money.

At the same time, he wants to plug up loopholes (favored treatment) supposedly existing in some taxes. This would bring about \$3.5 billion into the U.S. Treasury, actually leaving about \$10 billion in our pockets with which to buy more goods and services and create more jobs.

Well, loophole plugging sounds fine but many of the routes by which money escapes the Federal tax collector are not loopholes at all; they are proper avenues for the support of the best part of American life.

Just why churches, hospitals, YMCA's, YMCA's, seminaries, private schools and private colleges, and charitable institutions of other kinds are treated as loopholes by the President and his advisers is hard to explain.

Deductions for interest paid (as on home loans), for State and local taxes, for accident losses and medical expenses are big loopholes, too, according to the tax reformers.

So, administration tax experts in Washington want to fix the law so only the amount of charitable contributions and above deductions in excess of 5 percent of income can be deducted for tax purposes.

This would mean, for example, that the taxpayer with taxable income of \$4,500 would get no deduction for the first \$225 he paid for the above so-called loopholes. That's wrong because if he wants to give \$50 or \$100 of that to his church he should

March 18

get a tax deduction. A church is no loophole.

As incomes go up, charitable contributions usually increase in dollar amount. People with higher incomes weigh in heavily with financial support of churches and other charitable institutions.

Small and large contributions from incomes have provided millions of dollars for the building and spiritual programs of churches in South Wood County in the last 15 years. More such contributions must be counted on here in the future.

A drive for Riverview Hospital may be made in the next year or two and again small and large contributions from income will be sought for that construction. And they should be tax deductible.

This move by Kennedy's tax boys to disallow deductions under 5 percent of income is partly to force people to list their deductions and figure out what if any part comes to over 5 percent.

The reformers think that if it seems like too much trouble people won't bother to itemize. And that would make it a lot less work for the Internal Revenue Service to audit tax returns.

But disallowing perhaps hundreds of dollars of a family's contributions is a poor way to stimulate the economy. Money spent on churches and other charitable institutions buys goods and services and creates jobs in the best kind of way.

Members of Congress will be happy to hear your views before they vote on whether to reform tax laws.

National Rice Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from one of the major rice-producing States, I am pleased to call attention to the observance of National Rice Week now under way.

Rice is produced in greater abundance than any other food and it has been the principal—frequently the sole—sustenance for half the people of the world for thousands of years. It is produced on every continent, in every hemisphere and in practically every country. The U.S. rice industry customarily participates in 15 to 20 percent of world trade in rice.

Rice was brought to the United States in 1694 by a ship, enroute from Madagascar to England, which was blown off its course during a storm and forced to land at Charleston, S.C., for repairs. When the ship had been made ready to continue on its voyage the captain gave the Governor of the colony a small parcel of rough rice, from which enough rice was soon grown to supply South Carolina and neighboring colonies. From South Carolina production moved to Louisiana, then to other States. Today rice is produced in 13 States, with the major production in Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and California.

Rice, the energy food, is relatively low in price but high in nutriment. It is a favorite with housewives because it is

easy to prepare, economical, tasty, and versatile—it goes well with any meal, almost any dish.

In celebration of National Rice Week, March 17 to 23, an extensive advertising campaign is being conducted in news media. Newspaper and magazine food editors all over the United States are being provided with rice recipe material and photographs to be used in giving the public detailed information concerning the importance and value of this vital food. The advertising is being done by private brand distributors and by the Rice Council, a national organization of the rice industry for promoting domestic consumption, supported by voluntary contributions from all rice growers and millers.

Also active in the interest of the rice industry is the Rice Millers' Association, a nonstock, nonprofit, incorporated trade association of the rice milling industry. Organized in 1899, it is composed of a majority of the commercial rice mills of the United States, and is headed by Mr. J. P. Gaines as executive vice president, with headquarters in Washington. For a great many years, until his retirement, Mr. William M. Reid, who has done so much for the welfare and development of the rice industry, served as president.

The Rice Millers' Association has announced that in observance of National Rice Week, the rice industry will sponsor a free serving of a rice dish to all persons who dine at the restaurants and cafeterias at the U.S. Capitol on Wednesday, March 20. There will be table notices announcing that the rice is being provided with the compliments of rice growers, millers and Members of Congress from the rice growing States, each of which will be named. I am happy to join with my colleagues from these States in extending a hearty invitation to all Capitol diners to share in this treat.

Soviet-Czechoslovakian-Cuban Politico-Military Power Drive in Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the vital interests of this Nation are at stake in the current struggle for political power in Haiti.

A combined force of Soviet-Czechoslovakian-Cuban Communists have penetrated and infiltrated the Haitian Government. They are now in the process of consolidating their political power within the Haitian Government.

The Soviet is establishing, step-by-step, the political power foundation in Haiti for another massive Communist military offensive force to be directed against the United States.

Our lack of effective counter political action again exposes the rigidity, futility, and sterility of the policies, strategies,

and tactics of our Government in dealing with the nonmilitary phases of the Soviet world political power war.

I present a copy of a letter written to the Department of State, the National Security Council, and the Central Intelligence Agency on this impending crisis.

The letter follows:

SOVIET-CZECHOSLOVAKIA-CUBAN POLITICO-MILITARY POWER DRIVE IN HAITI

MARCH 15, 1963.

THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK: I am certain that you are aware of the powerful Communist influences that exist in the Haiti Government.

It is a matter of public knowledge that the Minister of Finance, married to a French Communist, was expelled from Paris for Communist activities. The closest adviser of the President was the leader of the Haitian Communist Party in 1946. The Minister of Information and Coordination, the only minister to survive eight successive Cabinet shakeups, along with his brother, the Director of Economic Control, make no secret of their open admiration, enthusiasm, and sympathies for Castro and his regime.

Haiti today is seething with unrest and insurrection possibilities. Under the Haitian constitution, a presidential election will be held in May of this year. It is quite possible that a revolutionary crisis will take place in Haiti during, or shortly after, this presidential election.

In the event of the overthrow of the Duvalier government, it is certain that Duvalier's Communist Cabinet officers will assume power and convert Haiti into a Castro-type Communist dictatorship.

I am authoritatively advised that neither the National Security Council, the State Department, nor the Central Intelligence Agency have formulated any practical policies or strategies to prevent a Castro-type Communist takeover in Haiti in the event of an insurrection during or after the May presidential election.

Our diplomatic and Central Intelligence representatives in Haiti have been unable to slow down or stop the progressive deterioration of United States-Haiti relations. The sharp curtailment of U.S. aid to Haiti is forcing Duvalier to solicit economic assistance from the Soviet.

Newspapers have recently reported the arrival of Czechoslovak experts who are the advance agents for a Soviet absorption of the Haiti Government.

This Soviet penetration of Haiti will necessarily and progressively extend into a political, economic and military domination of the nation.

I am aware that your Department has announced that the United States will, on request, give military assistance to any Latin American nation threatened with Communist takeover. Mr. Secretary, it is abundantly clear that such a request will never come from Dr. Duvalier, nor from his Soviet-Cuban backed potential successors.

In October 1962, the Congress passed a joint resolution which empowered the President to "prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of the hemisphere."

This policy is meaningless if the executive department does not choose to implement the authority granted by the Congress.

It appears that no specific alternative plans have been formulated, or are ready for activation, to anticipate and forestall the step-by-step Soviet takeover of Haiti.

Mr. Secretary, I respectfully ask that the State Department, in conjunction with the

National Security Council and the Central Intelligence Agency, formulate adequate policies and prepare such plans of action as may be necessary to prevent the Soviet from establishing in Haiti another Cuban-type military threat to the safety of this Nation.

Psychological Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, Frank J. Johnson, editor of the American Security Council's Washington Report delivered a most meaningful address to the National Security Commission of the American Legion on the subject of psychological warfare.

Mr. Johnson's penetrating remarks were as follows:

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

(Remarks by Frank J. Johnson, editor, Washington Report, American Security Council, before the National Security Commission meeting, March 12, 1963.)

My topic today is psychological warfare. It is an appropriate topic. Appropriate because the cold war may ultimately be won or lost by the proper employment, or lack of it, of psychology. And this begins with the psychological problem here at home. It has to do with the root philosophy of our cold war strategy. Unless this Government, and unless our people understand why there is no end in sight to the cold war, and why it is we have steadily less rather than more security, and why we encounter nothing but frustration in our desire to achieve a peaceful world, we will be talking about psychological warfare in a vacuum—simply an exercise in debate or rhetoric—mere words tossed to the winds of time which blow not with us but against us.

I want to illustrate these remarks by dealing first with a specific of foreign policy, Cuba, and then attempt to show how this specific is conditioned by the underlying fallacy of our cold war strategy.

I'll begin on Cuba by quoting a statement from Churchill. Said he, "There is no worse mistake in public leadership than to hold out false hopes soon to be swept away. The people can face peril or misfortune with buoyancy, but they bitterly resent being deceived, or finding that those responsible for their affairs are themselves dwelling in a fool's paradise."

The events of the past 4 months fit Churchill's remark extraordinary well. A massive psychological warfare campaign is now being waged on the American people to convince them that all is well. It comes in every speech from a State Department official; it comes in TV spectaculars and White House news conferences. It was exemplified by a speech of Vice President Johnson last month in which he asserted that 1962 saw the great turn against world communism; and he based that in large part on events in the Caribbean and Latin America. And the Gallup poll seems to show that the people on balance believe it. The majority is still satisfied with our conduct on foreign affairs. Are they being deliberately deceived? No, I don't think so. Our leaders are probably not as optimistic as they appear in public, but they do, to a degree, live themselves in a fool's paradise. They are genuinely convinced that they are following the course of

maximum security at minimum risk. I challenge this belief from top to bottom.

We won an important victory last fall; let's make no mistake on that. But we won it by doing what Walter Lippmann has warned that we must never do: We spoke to the Soviet in the language of ultimatum. Russia understood that unless we got satisfaction on the missile removal in a very short period of time there would be U.S. military action against Cuba. The forces were poised; public opinion was prepared; the United States was formally committed. Khrushchev knew that he was in great danger of losing his Cuban position entirely and that he would be able to do nothing about it. He chose, of course, to salvage what he could, accepting defeat in preference to a disastrous war or the ultimate humiliation of standing aside while U.S. Marines threw communism out of Cuba.

Though beaten from the start, the Soviets sought desperately to soften their defeat by extracting some concession in return. First came the proposal to swap for the missiles in Turkey: Refused (though now carried out); then the offer to withdraw their missiles and permit on-site inspection in return for a no-invasion guarantee. Was the Soviet contempt for our intelligence so enormous that they seriously expected us to accept this proposal? We cannot know. It must have at least seemed worth a try. We can only speculate that when it paid off there was a whistle of relief and perhaps incredulity in the Kremlin.

Certainly as an act of psychological warfare the offer even to consider a no-invasion pledge on Cuba at the very moment when we were on the verge of winning a tremendous and possibly decisive cold war victory, must rank as a first-class historical blunder. Its defenders argue that it was no more than a reaffirmation of the pledge given 6 weeks earlier that we would take no action against Cuba unless it became an offensive base. This was bad enough. But after October 22 the situation had changed. It changed the moment the first Soviet ship turned back before our blockade, thus demonstrating, for those who had doubts, that Russia would not fight a war over Cuba. At that point the enemy showed his fear, and every principle of strategy demanded that not the missiles but communism in Cuba should be the target.

But what did we do? With the enemy on the ropes and ready for the knockout we graciously stepped back and offered him the opportunity to get a second wind. The conditional offer of no-invasion guarantee struck an enormous psychological blow at the morale of the anti-Castro Cubans and put new heart in his shaken defenders. And if there is a hard-line faction in Moscow it must have given them a potent new argument.

It is not too much to say that on the weekend of October 27-28 the scales of human destiny hung precariously in the balance. Sometimes this happens in history. There is a moment of time in which a single decision by a few men will profoundly affect the whole future of humanity. On October 22, 1962, we left the "age of innocence." On October 27, when we offered to give the no-invasion pledge, we reentered it, and perhaps fatally this time. The cold war, which may then have been tipping strongly in our favor, may at that moment of time have tipped suddenly the other way, and our own final decline and defeat may have begun.

This is a grim statement and I hope that I am wrong. I qualify it with the word "may" because it was not the decision itself which was so disastrous—this can still be reversed—but the state of mind, the cold war psychology which produced it and was revealed by it. And this state of mind can change also. There is still time, but not much time.

Consider what has happened in the past 4 months. The psychology which ran so strongly for us in the days after October 22 now runs almost as strongly against us. Our psychological victory over Russia—and that is what it was primarily—has turned to ashes. We never formally gave that no-invasion guarantee, but this is semantic quibbling. Everyone understands that the Government now intends no forcible action to remove communism from Cuba. There has been a resulting sharp reversal of the atmosphere. Castro has emerged from the crisis almost unscathed and Soviet prestige has been largely restored. Vastly encouraged by these facts, Latin American revolutionaries have redoubled their efforts. The whole hemisphere has become a tinder box. The situation is highly dangerous in half a dozen countries.

Cuba is important to Khrushchev and to communism generally. It is enormously important. It has become the fulcrum of the cold war and now overshadows all else, because it is the key to the accelerating Communist offensive in Latin America. Its continued existence as a Communist state, in the face of repeated U.S. pledges and one abortive effort at the Bay of Pigs to liberate it, serves to demonstrate the impotence of the United States and gives great psychological impetus, purely apart from its physical use as a base, to the Communist offensive, which is primarily psychopolitical. The missiles are gone, yes, but the threat from Cuba is greater now than ever before.

Let us recall this to mind: We have long been pledged to go to thermonuclear war if necessary to keep the Soviets out of West Berlin. Why? Because its fall would increase the military threat to Europe or ourselves. Of course not. It is because the psychological effect of a U.S. retreat from a firm commitment would be devastating.

And so it is now with Cuba. Cuba is the West Berlin of the Western Hemisphere. Only here the absolutely vital imperative of U.S. policy is not just to keep it out of Communist hands, it is too late for that; it is to regain Cuba for the free world. We are committed to this. We have ample power to do it. Continued failure to do it will be just as disastrous in its effect, much more so in fact than a decision to retreat from Berlin the next time the Soviets put on the pressure.

I think our policymakers generally recognize the imperative of freeing Cuba. What they do not realize is that there is no safe or painless way to do it. Diplomatic and economic pressure alone will not work. It is going to require some element of force or the clear and unequivocal threat of force. This is because the U.S. imperative to remove communism is matched by an equal imperative of Soviet policy to maintain it there if this can be done without war with the United States. Khrushchev will never voluntarily give it up. He will invest whatever is necessary to keep it going. Soviet troops and equipment are in Cuba to make sure that communism will not be overthrown by anything short of direct U.S. military intervention. These are the grim facts but Washington either will not accept their truth or will not face up to their consequences.

Current Soviet policy is to deter the employment of U.S. force against Cuba. There are two ways to do this—by threats and by conciliation. Thus, on the one hand, Khrushchev and Defense Minister Malinovsky go further than ever before in warning that an attack on Cuba will mean world war III. They stop short of any formal commitment along these lines, such as taking Cuba into the Warsaw Pact, but they know the threats add fuel to those who argue that we must not employ force for this reason.

On the other hand, there is the continuing exchange of secret letters between Khrush-

shev and the President. The revelation that Khrushchev has offered to withdraw "several thousand" troops by March 15 is a clue to their general drift. In the face of our presumed continued prodding on troop withdrawal, Khrushchev demonstrates his "good will" by a conciliatory gesture. There is always just enough "give" to his position to keep us heading down the primrose path in the belief that a diplomatic solution is just around the corner, thereby cutting the ground from under the "hawks" who press for immediate action.

In this manner, troop withdrawal could be strung out for years. But this is not the real issue any more than the missiles. The real issue is elimination of communism from Cuba, and quickly, very quickly. Troop withdrawal should be regarded only as a means to this end, to be quickly followed by other steps. But our policymakers turn a deaf ear to this argument. There is not a single statement which suggests any sense of urgency. Why not? It is because current policy is imprisoned by the fundamental, justifying fallacy which has dominated the whole conduct of the cold war: that we can do business with a Soviet Union still determined to destroy us. The corollary of this is that the chief danger to the world is the bomb and not communism, and that every issue is negotiable if there is only enough patience.

There is no other explanation for the failure to convert the Soviet defeat of last October into a rout. The strong action announced on October 22 was a temporary aberration from the usual mold of American policy. It was dictated by the bold enemy stroke which threatened at once to upset the military balance and which permitted no time for protracted negotiation. But the moment the Soviets yielded on this point to our own power play, the United States lacked the courage, the foresight and the wisdom to grasp the full implications of what this policy aberration had achieved. We gave a sigh of relief that the immediate crisis had passed and returned our policy into its accustomed groove. As a policymaker in the Kremlin might have put it, "We were eyeball to eyeball and the other fellow just blinked."

The most amazing and revealing thing about us was the orgy of self-delusion in which we wallowed in the month immediately following. It was freely predicted that the Cuban crisis marked the end of an era in Soviet foreign policy. This great Soviet defeat was the final bankruptcy of Khrushchev's policy, his last-gasp haymaker from the floor of the ring. Nothing further was required from us; the Soviet would conclude that the cold war was now too dangerous and might genuinely change their outlook on world affairs; the discredited Castro's days were numbered and he would soon fade away. Rushed, with false confidence, the United States embarked on yet another effort to find a new "spirit of Camp David."

Today we find ourselves in the ruins of these hopes but they will not die; there are words of peace and coexistence from Moscow, to be sure, and there is opposition to the rash adventurism of the Chinese. But they are mixed with the chilly blasts of Soviet nuclear diplomacy and the savage, unforgiving hostility to all that we stand for. There are no settlements and the enemy offensive through the center of our line gathers momentum.

Yet the search for a settlement goes on, and we must not rock the boat on Cuba. We must not press Khrushchev too hard lest we back him into a corner, or lest we upset the delicate balance of diplomatic negotiation. That promises a nuclear test ban, removal of the Soviets from Cuba, and maybe that will-o'-the-whisp, disarmament. Unflinching in its belief that these negotiations can succeed, the Government pleads for patience and argues that all is well.

Here, I submit, is the deadly state of mind that in the end will bring us communism or nuclear destruction, or both. And the two are not mutually exclusive. It is a fallacy to think that world communism will bring world peace. The subsequent struggle between Communists fighting for ultimate world power would be too frightful to imagine. There is no peace in surrender.

But no one is now talking of surrender. The really deep gulf between the two serious schools of thought on foreign policy in this country is between those who think that serious negotiations and permanent settlements and accommodations are possible with the Soviets and those who believe that this is by definition impossible until the hostile Soviet purpose is first changed. And the corollary of this view is that the Soviet purpose can never be changed by containment alone.

The first school of thought has always been dominant in this country. There has been no permanent success for their policies but the hard line alternative is always judged to be worse. And so we go on and on with the burden of proof more than ever on the conciliators. Few would deny that under the containment strategy the drift of events has increased rather than decreased the ultimate prospect of war.

Here is the great philosophical issue: Can any really genuine agreement be reached on any vital issue without at least a minimum of mutual good will? Can the nuclear genie be put back in the bottle while the cold war goes on? My answer is a flat "No." There has been no disarmament, nor can there be, except on Soviet terms which are clearly intended to improve their military capabilities relative to our own. And this certainly applies to a nuclear test ban.

In short, can any of the really great problems of the world be solved until the cold war has ended? And is there any way to end it without winning it? And does not winning it imply, at the absolute minimum, the abandonment by the Soviet Union of its basically hostile, aggressive policy toward the West?

Here is another thesis of containment which I challenge, namely that we can both fight the cold war and satisfy the "revolution of rising expectations" of the underdeveloped nations. This is a real problem, and unless we at least partially bridge the economic gap, the world will be in turmoil, communism or no communism.

Under the "evolution" concept of cold war victory, one of the prerequisites is an economic and social transformation of the underdeveloped world to end the attraction of communism. I submit that this is impossible and a reversal of priorities. We can win the cold war in the sense I have defined it without first transforming the underdeveloped world. We cannot bring about this transformation without first winning the cold war. The "haves" cannot successfully aid the "have nots" until they first settle the civil war between themselves.

The reasons for this are fairly obvious. So long as we have to go on spending \$50 billion plus on defense, we cannot extend foreign aid on anywhere near the scale that it must be extended if we are to significantly raise the living standards of the poor nations. Furthermore, the cold war prevents us from making effective use of the aid which we do give. "Political considerations" involved in the cold war prevent us from exercising the necessary degree of internal interference in the economies of the recipient countries to make sure the aid is wisely and efficiently utilized. About the best we can hope to do is keep up with the exploding populations, if even that.

On the other hand, if we first win the cold war, which is the only way we can end the arms race, we and the Russians might then be able to join hands in a concerted

foreign aid program which would quite openly interfere in the receiving countries to whatever degree was necessary to get the job done.

But we are not winning the cold war and we may be losing it. It shows no signs of ending: On that everyone must agree. Precisely because there continues to be "good fishing" in the underdeveloped world, precisely because the containment policy imposes no real risks to the Soviet Union, and precisely because it offers the Soviets reason to believe that their ultimate objectives can yet be achieved, containment puts no real pressure or inducement on the Soviets to change their hostile policy toward us. As such I believe it is the path of greater rather than lesser risk to the United States. This risk includes not only the possibility of ultimate political defeat but of nuclear war as well. The Chinese are insisting that the United States does not have the will to fight. Too many efforts on our part to be conciliatory may cause the Soviets to delude themselves into believing the Chinese are right, which could lead some day to a fatal miscalculation of the risks on their part. Our failure to carry through on Cuba when all the military advantages lie with us will hardly convince the Kremlin "hardliners" that their policy is bankrupt.

On the other hand, U.S. military intervention in Cuba, abandonment of the fiction that disarmament is possible in the absence of a termination of the cold war, full-scale economic and political warfare against the Soviet Union, encouragement rather than discouragement to nationalist guerrilla operations against the Chinese Communists, and a full and frank explanation to the American people as to why all these things, and more, are necessary might add up to the psychological warfare necessary to finally "persuade" the Soviet Union that its interests really do lie in making a permanent settlement with the West. We keep telling them that this is so but we never do anything to convince them of it. I do not maintain that there is no risk in such a policy. There is no way to avoid risk in the thermo-nuclear age. Every alternative has its own dangers. But I suggest that in the long run the strategy which I propose runs less risk of a final nuclear holocaust than the one we are presently following. And I suggest that it is the only way in which we can hope to bring an end to the cold war.

Panama Canal: Congress Must Act To Prevent Threatened Liquidation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming meeting in San Jose, Costa Rica, March 18-20, which will be attended by the Presidents of the Central American Republics and the President of the United States, has again focused attention on the Caribbean situation in which the Panama Canal is the key element. It was, therefore, with much gratification that I noted the introduction by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], of House Concurrent Resolution 105, which aims to clarify the present confused understanding of the U.S. sovereign rights,

rule—both sections 332 and 137 of title 28 of the United States Code provide for this. There is also ample precedent, and in situations not nearly so extreme.

3. As I mentioned earlier, the protective use of Federal marshals directed by the Attorney General to prevent local law officers from molesting prospective Negro voters as they try to register, and to provide protection to Negro protest movements exercising freedom of expression, will go a long way toward the final solution of this problem.

4. I would also suggest to this administration that it is about time that in appointing Federal officials in the South, their position on civil rights be taken into consideration. I do not know of a single Federal official in the entire State of Mississippi who is a Negro. A favorable Federal power position in each Southern State would be of great value in achieving civil rights for Negroes in the South.

5. And, finally, the second section of the 14th amendment, providing for the reduction in representation of a State's delegation in the House of Representatives and the electoral college in the proportion that a State denies any of its citizens the right to vote for any reason other than age or residence within the State, is indeed a powerful weapon that has lain dormant. Its great power lies in the fact that it can be enforced in many ways; in that it is crystal clear and mandatory; in that it is in no sense dependent upon discrimination against race, creed or color, but deals only with results different from near-universal suffrage, and in that it exacts a great price from a State for its limitation upon free and general voting. The House of Representatives can, under its ample constitutional powers, enforce this provision. It did so in 1872. The House is not hampered with the filibuster and can move rapidly, even tomorrow. I urge the creation of a movement to have the second section of the 14th amendment enforced by Congress.

I close with a word of thanks again to the New York Civil Liberties Union and the American Civil Liberties Union for the work they are doing in the southern civil rights struggle and for the opportunity to present these thoughts here this evening to this distinguished audience.

U.S. Military Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit a thought-provoking memorandum by Mr. Seymour Melman, associate professor of industrial and management engineering, Columbia University, New York.

Professor Melman deals with the subject of U.S. military power as it presently exists, the question of how much military power is necessary, the 1964 military budget, the impact of our military budget upon a declining domestic economy and the flight of gold, and many other problems related to military spending.

While I do not agree with some of Mr. Melman's arguments and recommendations, I do find his treatment of

this subject most intriguing, especially the subject of "military overkill."

The memorandum follows:

How Much Military Power Is Enough?

(By Seymour Melman, associate professor of industrial and management engineering, Columbia University)

Soon after President Kennedy presented a 1964 military budget request totaling \$56.7 billion, Secretary of Defense McNamara told us that "we calculate that our forces today could still destroy the Soviet Union without any help from the deployed tactical air units, or carrier task forces, or Thor or Jupiter intermediate range ballistic missiles."

The military fact behind this judgment is an American military overkill capability that is in excess of almost anyone's conception. The idea of overkill is a thermonuclear invention. Never before could one think of military power sufficient to kill people more than once. But now the abundance of military power is so great that ordinary prudence dictates a reduction in the military budget request. Without reducing the massive forces already in being, we could cut the military budget enough to handle many pressing national problems and open up new opportunities for American policy.

NOW 125 TIMES OVERKILL

In 1963 about 3,390 strategic weapons, major aircraft, and missiles, are available to the U.S. Air Force and Navy. These major vehicles can deliver warheads whose total power is equivalent to 21.97 billion tons of TNT. (The bomb dropped on Hiroshima, which killed 100,000 people, was the equivalent of 20,000 tons of TNT.) All of this does not include the fighter planes, intermediate- and short-range missiles, torpedoes, mines, cannon, and tactical rocket launchers like the Davy Crockett. And the stockpile of warheads is probably as much as twice the total that is deliverable by the major aircraft and missiles now in hand.

What is the possible military significance of this much nuclear power?

Let us call this relationship a "Hiroshima equivalent" and let us use this in some military calculations that are at once nightmarish and realistic.

On the entire surface of the earth there are now about 2,000 cities of over 100,000 population, containing about 600 million people. If every one of these cities were a target for nuclear destruction and if there were an allowance of 30 percent of failure to deliver to target, then the U.S. strategic vehicles alone could deliver the equivalent of 2½ million tons of TNT for each 100,000

Strategic weapon systems operational in calendar year 1963

Type	Weapon system	Number of delivery vehicles	Yield per delivery vehicle (megatons)	Total yield (megatons)
U.S. Air Force:				
Aircraft	B-47's.....	600	10	6,000
	B-52's.....	800	20	12,000
	B-58's.....	100	20	2,000
Total		1,300		20,000
Missiles	Atlas.....	120	(1)	120
	Titan I.....	50	(1)	50
	Titan II.....	30	(1)	30
	Minuteman.....	500	(1)	500
Total		700		700
U.S. Navy:				
Aircraft	Skyhawk A-4D.....	1,000	(1)	1,000
	Skywarrior A-6D.....	150	(1)	150
	(Vigilante A-3J).....	(?)		
Total		1,500		1,500
Missiles	15 Polaris submarines with 16 missiles each.....	240	0.5	120
Total		3,900		21,970

¹ 21,970,000,000 tons of TNT equivalent.

NOTE.—Above table does not include smaller planes, intermediate- and short-range missiles, torpedoes, mines, cannon, tactical rocket launchers (Bazooka, Davy Crockett) etc. Also, warhead stockpile is possibly two times and more, than delivery vehicles.

Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Jan. 16, 1963, pp. 393-416.

people. Since it took only 20,000 tons to kill 100,000 people at Hiroshima, the United States now possesses an overkill capability on this global scale of 125 times.

In the Sino-Soviet bloc there are about 370 cities whose people amount to approximately 1,400 "Hiroshima equivalents." Again, with allowance for 30 percent attrition, the U.S. overkill capability in relation to the entire Sino-Soviet area is now 500 times.

Finally, the Soviet Union alone contains about 140 cities with 100,000 population or more, altogether approximately 500 "Hiroshima equivalents." Allowing in this case for 50 percent failure to deliver warheads, the United States alone could deliver about 25 megatons per "Hiroshima equivalent." This amounts to a U.S. overkill capability of 1,250 times.

MAINTENANCE OF PRESENT FORCES MILITARY BUDGET

I think there are very few Americans who would suggest that such an overkill capability is insufficient. Many Americans might rest assured knowing that we can kill all the people of the Communist bloc just once.

Accordingly, I have made a preliminary analysis of the proposed military budget in order to estimate the cost of maintaining present forces. The results are shown in the accompanying table. Military personnel and pay increases are held intact, and so is the entire operational and maintenance budget—for this provides for the continuance of the presently existing military power. The procurement item, however, can be reduced at least \$6 to \$10 billion. Similar reasoning suggests sharp curtailment of the military development and construction items. Provisions for family housing are retained.

A1488

A U.S. military budget to maintain forces at present level

(In millions of dollars)

Major military functions	Recommended new spending in administration budget for 1964	Possible reduction
Department of Defense—Military functions:		
Military personnel:		
Present programs	\$13,235	
Proposed legislation to increase military compensation	900	
Operational and maintenance	11,792	\$6,000 \$10,000
Procurement	16,725	7,000
Research, development, tests, and evaluation	7,262	1,232
Military construction	1,232	
Family housing	734	
Civil defense	300	300
Military assistance	1,480	1,480
Atomic energy	2,893	2,000
Defense-related activities:		
Stockpiling of strategic and critical materials	28	28
Selective Service System	38	
Emergency preparedness activities:		
Present programs	52	52
Proposed legislation	30	30
Total	\$6,702	\$18,646 \$22,646
Possible reduced budget		\$4,056 \$8,056

Source: Analysis of Federal activities by function, from "The Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1964," U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963. P. 61.

The civil defense item is eliminated since this whole activity is technically unsound and politically dangerous.

The military assistance item is cut on the grounds that further addition to existing military capability serves no plausible function.

The administration's recommendation on atomic energy deserves to be cut by about two-thirds since further production of warheads makes no kind of sense at all. The present stockpile of warheads is far in excess of delivery capability. The same applies to the industrial stockpiling activity, which is already an economic and a physical embarrassment.

All told, this preliminary estimate points to the possibility of reducing the military budget proposal by \$18 to \$22 billion while retaining in full state of operational readiness military forces that already have incredibly large overkill capability.

The implied freeing of \$18 to \$22 billion in the Federal budget for other purposes should make possible a fresh approach to a set of grave national problems that have been caused by our sustained heavy military spending.

FIVE NATIONAL PROBLEMS

While spending about 10 percent of our gross national product each year for fresh military forces, we have been drawing away capital from other uses and allocating the Nation's prime productive asset—our scientific and engineering talent—into military work. Having done this, and having spent about \$450 billion for these purposes during the last 10 years, we have generated our side of a thermonuclear stalemate with the U.S.S.R. and a set of grave national problems.

(1) The civilian economy of the United States, deprived of fresh capital investment and technological manpower, has entered a period of deepening stagnation. Many of the industries that lie at the base of a modern industrial system, like those producing machinery of many sorts, now show the symptoms of technological and economic decline. These industries are the center of our unused industrial capacity and of industrial unemployment. Ten percent of America's gross national product is used for military purposes. That 10 percent contains well over half the Nation's scientists and engineers, whose services are used for military purposes.

These conditions are undermining the world competitive position of American industry. In 1960, for example, while we spent about 10 percent of our goods and services

for military purposes, the countries in the Common Market spent 4 percent. During the same year we spent 5 percent for machinery and equipment for our industries, while the countries of the Common Market spent 10 percent for theirs. The result has been plain for all to see: full employment and rapid economic development in the countries of the Common Market, and economic stagnation in many regions of the United States.

(2) The flight of gold from the Federal Treasury has reached the point where it jeopardizes the international value of the dollar. Twelve years ago the U.S. Government held \$24 billion in gold bullion. Today the gold stock has been reduced to about \$15 billion. This compares to \$12 billion that is legally required as the basis for our currency. At the same time about \$19 billion in claims against U.S. gold is held by the central bankers of foreign countries and by various private individuals. While causes for the adverse balance of payments over these years are composed of many elements, one element dominates the scene and converts a favorable balance of trade into an unfavorable balance of payments: heavy dollar spending abroad for military purposes.

(3) We have developed a new condition in American life, a bureaucracy that rules a military-industrial complex in the United States. Highly concentrated in particular States and regions (23.3 percent of manufacturing employees in California work in military industries; 30 percent of those in Kansas are so employed, but 1.1 percent of those in South Carolina) the military manufacturing industry takes orders directly from the Department of Defense and delivers its goods to that customer only. We have yet to see any serious steps by these military industrialists toward blueprinting the conversion of their firms from military to civilian economy.

(4) Thirty to forty million Americans live in the deepest poverty: they are poorly housed, poorly fed, poorly clothed. A capital fund and, even more important, the technical talent that might be used to raise the productivity of these people is being used elsewhere. One result is that one out of six Americans is virtually removed from the market, for these men, women, and children can scarcely afford the bare minimum of sustenance.

(5) While concentrating on military development at home and abroad, we have left more than half the population of the earth in a sustained condition of bleak poverty, and thus vulnerable to Soviet penetration.

Our foreign assistance program has been overwhelmingly military. We have not yet learned that as long as economic development is left to be carried out by a process of extracting taxes from an impoverished peasantry, a police state becomes the reasonable, necessary form of government. This will continue to be the case in Asia, Africa, and Latin America until we organize our enormous productive resources to make possible industrialization in the rest of the world under conditions that improve the level of living from the very start. The Asian, African, and Latin American countries will then have the option of economic development together with a measure of personal and political freedom.

All these problems require for their solution a shift of resources from military to productive uses. For, unlike most industrial production, military production is a dead end. Missiles are built, but they can only be tested, not used. The production of weapons leads to no further production, only to stockpiling. It does nothing to rectify the economic problems of the United States or the world.

NEW POLICY OPPORTUNITIES

The large savings that are possible in our military expenditures, even while maintaining enormous power, allows us to raise fresh questions about our whole world strategy. The world policy of the United States has been based on the assumption that military power is the indispensable instrument for resolving national conflicts. What are the possible alternatives to this view? Could the productive capability of the United States be used as an instrument of power? One calculation is that if we use our productive might to generate economic development at home and abroad, then we could confront Soviet leaders with an altogether new situation: An industrial thrust from the United States of such power and political consequences that in order to meet it the Soviets, for their part, would have to take disarmament seriously. For the U.S.S.R. has no unused industrial capacity. Its smaller industrial base could provide major additions to industrial output only by the conversion of its military complex. Could such a strategy, a peace race, break the negotiating deadlock which now plagues all disarmament efforts?

Lastly, don't these calculations of military overkill put the whole problem of the risks of a test ban in a fresh light? Against the background of the massive military might already in hand, the risks of entering into a test-ban agreement with the U.S.S.R., under reasonable inspection, look like an opportunity for a call of halt to the spread of nuclear weaponry. For the spread of overkill does not produce security.

A prudent national budget can maintain the present military capacity while liberating large funds. These resources are the proper size for ameliorating grave national problems, and for mounting an alternative system of power politics based upon our industrial, productive might.

Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuba Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I think it would behoove each of us who

would be a self-appointed chairman of the "Subcommittee on Cuba" to read the statesmanlike speech by the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. MANSFIELD, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8. In that speech, entitled "Cuban Disclosures and Foreign Policy," the distinguished leader poses three questions any critic should ask himself. First, am I talking for a partisan purpose? Second, am I talking with the full realization that my words may help to drive the people and the President's course toward war, limited or unlimited? Third, am I talking with the belief that my words will help the President in his primary task of safeguarding the security of the United States and its national reputation for honesty, integrity, and decency while he attempts to exert a constructive influence for freedom and peace, not only with respect to Cuba, but throughout the hemisphere and the world?

A conscientious answer to these questions might serve to direct such criticisms to dispassionate and constructive ends. Surely rational men can argue reasonable alternatives without producing sensationalism and squandering the fruits of past triumphs. I think history will show that a definite shift in the power balance of the world occurred on Sunday morning last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. What remains to be done is another question altogether and certainly deserves the best answers from all of us. Let us proceed in that way. Mr. Speaker, in this vein, I submit an article by Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down, and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's preemptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weak-kneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel-chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parol himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

RESCUE ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be rescued from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively

supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already abuilding takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Viet-Cong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is as totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest U.S. aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from the U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And, they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S. support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of war of liberation that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUCCESS THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is

composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a "smash and grab" raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A gentle smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. These negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

ATTENTION TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counter revolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

Report on Oil Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 6, 1963

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Select Committee on Small Business, I was pleased to note an article which appeared in the February 1963 issue of Independent Petroleum Monthly respecting House Report No. 2567, issued by Subcommittee No. 4, of which my colleague, the Honorable Tom Steed, is chairman.

This is an important subject, and in order to give it wide attention, I have requested permission that the article be reprinted in the Record. The article follows:

STEED SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT ON EFFECTS OF FOREIGN OIL IMPORTS ON U.S. BUSINESS

Representative TOM STEED's subcommittee, which has kept the spotlight on business problems created by petroleum imports, has called for further study during the 88th Congress of the manifold problems connected with the excessive importation of petroleum and petroleum products from foreign sources.

In a report to the chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, STEED's subcommittee said that President Kennedy's revision of the import program on November 20 will not solve the problem. The report said, however, that "the subcommittee is happy to see adopted for the first time the principle of import quotas based on domestic production.

"Properly implemented, this approach can bring to the domestic oil industry for the first time in the last 8 years a share of the expanding market and thus stimulate the exploration so essential to our national security," it was added.

The subcommittee, which held extensive hearings on the imports problem during the 87th Congress, said a second improvement in the import control program, along the lines of the subcommittee's recommendation, is the inclusion of presently exempt overland imports within the overall relationship to domestic production. "Overland imports thus would not be able to increase further at the expense of U.S. production," the report said.

The subcommittee quoted Harold Decker, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America: "Improvements in the program . . . will contribute to the Nation's security position as to oil supplies, although this perhaps will be more a long-range than immediate benefit . . . Further action to improve the oil import program will be necessary to assure adequate supplies for the consuming public and the national security."

The Steed report said "the impact of the present high levels of imports of crude oil and petroleum products into this country had grown to such proportions as to constitute serious and immediate danger to the national security."

It added: "The international situation is today much more ominous than it has been since the end of the Korean conflict. It cannot be questioned that, in wartime, dependence cannot be placed on foreign fuels. A healthy, domestic oil and coal industry, capable of supplying both the civilian population and the military forces in time of emergency, is essential to national security."

In addition to continued study of the problems resulting from excessive imports of foreign crude oil and products, STEED's subcommittee listed other recommendations to Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business. These included:

1. There is urgent need for a better liaison between all the various branches of the Federal Government—in order to establish a unified and coordinated overall policy respecting petroleum.

2. Import quotas on crude oil, unfinished oils and finished petroleum products (excluding residual fuel oil to be used solely for fuel) be reduced immediately to 1 million barrels per day, or to an amount not to exceed 10 percent of domestic production for the preceding year, whichever is the lesser.

This would provide renewed incentive for exploration and development to domestic producers of oil, the report said.

3. As an alternative to a reduction in the quotas of imported oil and petroleum products, a tariff of at least \$1.25 on each barrel of foreign crude oil, unfinished oils, and finished petroleum products should be seriously considered.

4. An appropriate legislative committee should give consideration to amendment of the internal revenue laws to provide for a direct credit for income tax purposes for all oil sold by American producers in competition with Soviet bloc oil in the foreign world market.

This credit would be for the amount representing the difference between the price at which such oil would have to be sold to meet the Soviet competition and the quoted price of the prospective crude oil in foreign world market.

"This would be a particularly useful tool to employ as a counteroffensive measure to the Russian use of petroleum as an economic weapon," the Steed group said.

5. Import quotas on residual fuel oil, to be used solely as fuel, should be fixed at a level no higher than the total of such imports in 1961, so as to reduce the threat to national security which residual oil imports now create.

6. A suitable Government agency should immediately undertake a survey of essential plants and installations along the east coast, where more than 50 percent of all defense contracts are held and where virtually all imported residual oil is used.

This agency should determine the true extent to which those plants have become dependent on this insecure foreign source of fuel through abandonment of other types of burning and fuel handling.

The Steed subcommittee held hearings during the 87th Congress. Witnesses included oil industry leaders, officials of Federal and State Governments, and representatives from various trade associations, including the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

As a result of these hearings, the Steed subcommittee reported these findings:

1. The mandatory oil imports control program has not achieved its objectives since the domestic oil- and gas-producing industries are not in an economically healthy condition. State allowables are the lowest in history, exploration and drilling for oil and gas continue to decline, unemployment is increasing in the industry, crude oil production is static.

2. Decline in the domestic oil and gas industries has occurred even though the voluntary oil imports program, which failed, was followed by a mandatory program. The executive branch of the Government, with power to correct and adjust the import program, has not acted "to the degree necessary to achieve the objective."

3. The subcommittee noted the statement sometimes made that importation of petroleum would be good for the United States since it would tend to promote international trade and commerce and create a favorable international atmosphere.

The Steed group said: "It must be recognized that oil and its products belong to a different category from other commodities that flow in the channels of international trade. This is because petroleum is needed to propel the engines of defense and keep America's industry in production to supply those needs, not only for the Nation at peace, but also for those potential needs in case of an emergency or war.

"Should the United States become more and more dependent upon foreign sources of supply, while neglecting the development of its own producing and refining capacity, it would thereby greatly endanger its national existence," it was added.

1963

admiralty, and maritime jurisdiction of the United States and the high seas. As limited, it failed to cover such acts of espionage as those committed in the Scarbeck case.

This year, I have introduced H.R. 4897 which, if enacted, will have precisely the same effect with reference to the wartime sedition statute, 18 U.S.C. 2388. That statute makes it a criminal offense, punishable by a fine of not more than \$10,000 and/or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, for a person during time of war to make a false report designed to interfere with the operation of the Armed Forces, or to attempt to cause mutiny, or to obstruct the military enlistment service, or to conspire with another person to commit such acts. Under section 2391 of title 18, the provisions of section 2388 will remain in full force and effect "until 6 months after the termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950," unless sooner terminated by Congress.

The justification for this legislation parallels that under which Public Law 87-369 was enacted. By reason of our military, diplomatic, and commercial commitments around the world, American citizens are traveling in or resident in every quarter of the globe. The same is true of aliens who have been admitted to the United States as permanent residents in preparation for naturalization. Under the sedition statute as now written, they would be immune to prosecution for any seditious act which they might commit on foreign soil.

Wherever such an act is committed, it is directly injurious to the United States, and the Supreme Court has already decided in the case of *U.S. v. Bowman*, 260 U.S. 94, that regardless of the place committed, such acts can be punished if they fall within the jurisdiction of the statute. All that remains is for the Congress to broaden the jurisdiction of the sedition statute as H.R. 4897 provides.

I can foresee no substantial opposition to this legislation, and I earnestly trust that action can be expedited at this session of Congress.

THE DRIFT TOWARD SOFT MONEY

(Mr. STINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the March 1963 issue of the magazine *Realty and Rental Register* entitled "The Drift Toward Soft Money":

THE DRIFT TOWARD SOFT MONEY

When Franklin Roosevelt became President, the national debt was around \$25 billion. At that time, Fort Knox held about \$35 billion in gold. The United States of America owed nothing to foreign countries. The English economist Keynes then entered the area of influence in Washington, D.C. and deficit spending started in a decisive way. Both Republican and Democratic administrations succumbed to the Keynes doctrine that a government is not subject to the same fiscal rules that apply to an indi-

vidual or a business, in short, that deficit spending is wholesome. The *Manchester Guardian*, which largely reflects the Keynesian code, in an editorial of January 31, 1963, says this: "Millions of solid American citizens still believe that it is possible for a nation to spend itself into disaster." The implication is clear that followers of Keynes do not believe it is possible for a nation to spend itself into disaster. Many American economists have now embraced this philosophy with the result that the last three administrations have lifted the debt to \$300 billion, and within 2 years it appears it will rise to \$320 billion. The argument that we owe it to ourselves no longer is valid, because our goldpile is down to \$15 billion and we owe Europeans \$20 billion, leaving us with little or no gold backing to our currency. Everyone who owns a home, a banking account, or an interest in a business, should be acutely aware of this situation. Unless policies are reversed more heavy inflation is inevitable. To argue otherwise is to say that the nabobs of the new arithmetic are going to be able to expunge the facts of life.

HENRY BRODERICK.

MOTHER SETON BEATIFIED

(Mr. MATHIAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the eyes of the entire world turned to a simple building at Emmitsburg, Md. The "stone house" where Elizabeth Seton founded the Sisters of Charity. The focus through which this worldwide attention came to a secluded shrine in Maryland was through the magnificent, age-old ceremony in Rome when Mother Seton was beatified at the Vatican in a service conducted by Pope John XXIII.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans can be proud of this unique honor which has come to one of our own native daughters. All Americans can seek to exemplify in their own lives the charity and virtue of Mother Seton which have been recalled and published to the world in yesterday's ceremony in St. Peter's.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on this side of the aisle as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have expressed deep interest in this event. It is a privilege and an honor to call it to the attention of the Congress.

An evaluation of Mother Seton's work by the editors of the *Baltimore Sun* speaks of the "manifold ways" in which her influence continues to benefit Americans.

The editorial of today is appended:

BLESSED MOTHER SETON

The beatification of the first native-born citizen of the United States, baptized in the Episcopal Church, the granddaughter of an Episcopal clergyman, comes in a year when continents and communions alike are drawing closer together. Americans and Europeans, Christians of all persuasions and members of other religious groups look more to the things that join them and less to old divisions. Yet the present always roots in the past and Blessed Mother Seton's work began in a community which even in that earlier day was various and outward-looking.

To consider that work, the testing time that preceded it and its brevity in terms of years is to appreciate all over again what human excellence and religious inspiration

are. Elizabeth Ann Bayley, born into an old and wealthy New York family, was 3 when her mother died and a troubled childhood followed. At 23, the mother of two children, she became responsible for the six minor children of her father-in-law upon his death. Her husband died when she was 29, having lost his fortune and leaving her with five children of their own.

Two years later she entered the Catholic Church; 3 years after that she moved into the small house on Paca Street, Baltimore, where she launched the first American parochial school and in 1809 she and four associates organized the American Sisters of Charity. She had been a Catholic only 4 years and she had less than a dozen years before her death, but she left an order which planted schools, colleges, hospitals, orphanages across the whole face of America and through which her influence lives today in manifold ways and not least in the new comity among believers.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 11, I am recorded as failing to answer to my name. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

CENTRAL WISCONSIN TELEVISION, INC.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the Federal Communications Commission or Charles J. Frederick, hearing examiner, at the new Post Office Building, Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C., to testify on March 20, 1963, at 10 a.m., in the matter of Central Wisconsin Television, Inc., Federal Communications Commission docket No. 14933-14934. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
IN THE MATTER OF CENTRAL WISCONSIN TELEVISION, INC., ET AL.—DOCKET NO. 14933-14934

The President of the United States of America to ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Greeting:

You are hereby commanded under penalty of law to be and appear in your proper person before the Federal Communications Commission or Charles J. Frederick, hearing examiner, New Post Office Building, Pennsylvania Avenue and 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C., on March 20, 1963, at 10 o'clock a.m., then and there to testify on behalf of Wisconsin Citizens' Committee for Educational Television, Inc., in the above-entitled cause now pending before this Commission.

By order of the Federal Communications Commission, this 8th day of March 1963.
 CHARLES J. FREDERICK,
 Hearing Examiner.

CENTRAL AMERICA READY FOR U.S. LEADERSHIP ON CUBA

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President stated in his press conference of March 6:

I think we have indicated very clearly that what we feel is the wisest policy is the isolation of communism in this hemisphere.

This policy of isolation should have ready acceptance at the conference of Central American leaders meeting this week in Costa Rica with the President and congressional representatives. It is at this meeting that we have an excellent opportunity to provide the basis for action to isolate Cuba by the Organization of American States. It is in Central America that cries for firm, positive U.S. leadership in providing this action are loudest.

I urge again that the United States take the first step of leadership by closing its seaports to nations allowing their ships to trade with Cuba. Then this Government should suggest the following steps to the OAS for adoption by the nations of this hemisphere:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to ships trading with Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of this hemisphere to airlines with flights to Cuba.

Third. Ban movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout the hemisphere.

Fourth. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

Fifth. Freeze all Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Adoption of these steps would place Cuba in solitary confinement in this hemisphere. From events of recent weeks, it has become clear that we are faced with a master plan for subversion of continental proportions. I urge that this Government press for positive multilateral action to isolate Cuba at the current conferences in Central America.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS HAVING SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY OF DEAFNESS IN BOTH EARS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 199) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans having the service-connected disability of deafness of both ears.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

STATUTORY AWARD FOR APHONIA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 214) to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to point out that there is a report from the Bureau of the Budget in reference to this bill and to the previous bill. The Bureau of the Budget in these two reports does object to the approval of the two legislative proposals.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPEAL OF "MUSTERING-OUT PAYMENTS" SECTION OF TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 200) to repeal chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 43 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of chapters immediately before chapters 1 and 31 of title 38, United States Code, are each amended by striking out

"43. Mustering-Out Payments..... 2101".

(c) Subsection (c) of section 12 of the Act entitled "An Act to consolidate into one Act all of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration", approved September 2, 1958 (Public Law 85-857), is repealed.

Sec. 2. This Act shall take effect as of January 31, 1965.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 200 will repeal the obsolete mustering-out pay provisions of existing law effective January 31, 1965. Mustering-out pay was authorized by the Korean GI bill for active service in the Armed Forces between June 27, 1950, and January 31, 1955, for all ranks up to and including captain.

Like other readjustment programs established by the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, mustering-out payments were intended to aid persons who served during the Korean conflict in the transition to civil life. Consistent

with this purpose, it was designed to be a temporary program.

Inasmuch as the program has long since served its purpose, H.R. 200 will repeal the authority to make mustering-out payments. The date of repeal, January 31, 1965, is the date on which all provisions of the so-called Korean GI bill except the loan guaranty program will terminate. I urge its passage.

NEW MODIFIED LIFE PLAN FOR NSLI POLICYHOLDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 220) to amend section 704 of title 38, United States Code, to permit the conversion or exchange of policies of national service life insurance to a new modified life plan.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR DIRECTORS AND CHIEFS OF STAFF AT VA MEDICAL INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 228) to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the salary of directors and chiefs of staff of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, last year when the general Federal employees pay increase bill was enacted by Congress there was contained therein legislation dealing with directors of veterans' facilities. I understand this bill would repeal certain provisions of the law passed last year when the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service handled the legislation. I am not sure what the justification for the repeal of the law passed only last year may be; therefore, I want time to consult with the chairman and the members of the committee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WAIVER OF INDEBTEDNESS TO UNITED STATES IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 242) to amend section 1820 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide for waiver of indebtedness to the United States in certain cases arising out of default on loans guaranteed or made by the Veterans' Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make inquiry to find out the extent to which this waiver may be granted.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill would permit waiver of recovery from veterans or their spouses of any indebtedness owed the United States resulting

Appendix

Partisan Brawling Squanders Fruits of Cuban Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about Cuba and our foreign policy regarding it. Recently, many angry and partisan attacks upon the President and the administration have tended to obscure the fact that President Kennedy and the United States scored a major victory in the cold war in demanding that Russian missile systems be removed from Cuba and in having this fact accomplished in short order.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Philip L. Graham, president of the Washington Post, in a recent news story pointed out many of the true facts regarding the United States-Cuban policy.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Graham goes on to report that the responsibility for the final downfall of Castro rests with the people of Cuba themselves and that young leaders are now attempting to organize forces which will provide the downfall of a Communist government in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this article by Mr. Graham be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

PARTISAN BRAWLING SQUANDERS FRUITS OF CUBA TRIUMPH

(By Philip L. Graham)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—The fruits of America's greatest cold war triumph are being recklessly squandered by the partisan brawling over Cuba.

The triumph came on Sunday morning, last October 28, when Chairman Khrushchev announced the surrender of the Soviet missile systems in Cuba. Considering Khrushchev's usual prose style, the announcement was an epic of unambiguous brevity. The missile systems would be taken down and this would be certified by the U.N.

This came less than 6 days after the President's tough TV speech. Thus Mr. Kennedy forced the Soviet Union to agree to "disarmament with inspection," a reversal of years and years of obstinate Soviet rhetoric.

The ensuing reaction is enough to drive toward near despair any observer of our two-party system. Here was an indisputable example of the U.S. Government working soundly, sensibly, sagely under crisis conditions. The President turned his back alike on proponents of armed invasion and proponents of near appeasement.

The United States speedily gathered around Miami an array of armed power that could have bounced Castro all the way to the South Pole. While this "big stick" was being created, the President practiced the

sort of intensively skilled diplomacy that alone can find an option different from nuclear warfare or surrender.

A single instance showed the value of instructed and informed reflex action. That was the President's preemptory refusal to consider any trade involving our Turkish bases—and this despite a widespread affliction of weakkneed jitters on the part of many in and out of Government.

A THROWBACK TO KIPLING

One who visits the Caribbean area, even briefly, cannot help being appalled by the cacophony of abuse and jingoism that has come out of the United States on the heels of the President's success.

First came a caterwauling over the relatively ineffective Soviet bomber contingent, that remained briefly in Cuba. Next came a blather of criticisms of the U.S. intelligence system—either naively amateur in nature or viciously reckless of U.S. security if the sources happened to hold any responsible positions in our security organization.

Finally, there have come the trumpeting swivel chair warriors, stirred by blurred recollections of Kipling's days, who demand such belligerent acts as blockades. It is surprising that Mr. Nixon could so quickly parol himself from his self-announced sentence of long-term silence. It is appropriate, however, that he selected the setting of Mr. Jack Paar's program for the announcement of what in other circumstances would have constituted a grave demand for acts of war.

Seen from the Caribbean area, Mr. Kennedy's victory over the Cuban missiles is not diluted by these strangely motivated domestic attacks. The Kennedy policy has established, for the last Latin doubter, Castro's suppliant role as a Communist satellite. And by refusing to bring Castro down by the brute force of Yankee arms, Mr. Kennedy has restored faith in the maturity and sense of partnership with South America now infusing U.S. policy.

RESCUE ISN'T THE ANSWER

The Cuban exiles in the Caribbean area have fairly easy and constant communication with Cuba. They know that dissatisfaction with Castro is constantly growing. But they also know that within Cuba there is little desire to be rescued from Castro by Yankee arms, only to be returned to the chaos of corruption existing before Castro's tyranny.

"The people of Cuba," a leading exile said, "have done more fundamental political thinking in the past 4 years than in the preceding 50 years." And the Cuban people are reported as wanting not merely an overthrow of Castro, but the creation of a new governmental system that will permit Cubans, by themselves, to find a democratic destiny.

Cubans of this school of thought are horrified by the bellicosity of a Nixon. They are depressed by the partisan speeches in the United States which indicate that we should reassume a benevolent guardianship over Cuba.

Those Cubans who engaged in the early planning of the Bay of Pigs fiasco still remember the callous ideas of superiority held by CIA officials. "The first thing I was asked by the CIA officer in charge," says a leading Cuban exile, "was to state my attitude toward restoration of the King Ranch properties."

These exiles—predominantly young professional men of moderately liberal and democratic leanings—are determined that Castro

will be overthrown from within Cuba. They have no interest in a Guatemala type coup d'etat directed by the CIA—or any other outside organization.

They are seeking financial support without strings. And support is just beginning to come, in trickles, from among the exiles themselves and from other Caribbean democratic forces. This is aid without any strings, without any commitments aside from the moral assurance of these men that Cuba shall be freed of communism and freed of corruption.

TOPSY-TURVY SETTING

From the United States, these exiles and their working colleagues now in Cuba will welcome only a form of support for which we have little governmental experience. They do not want the large-scale, massively supervised support that has been America's method in South Korea and South Vietnam.

For in Cuba the tables are turned about topsy-turvy from the usual cold war setting. Here Castro occupies the place of Syngman Rhee or Diem—an unpopular leader propped by massive support of a major power. And in Cuba it is the Communist bloc, for once, that is trying to prop an unpopular government with an expensive supply line running across thousands of oceanic miles.

The anti-Castro resistance that is already a-building takes heart from the lessons of other areas. These Cubans know that 500,000 French soldiers, including the ruthless professionals of the Foreign Legion, could not conquer the relatively weak bands of native Algerian rebels. They know how large a threat to massive U.S. efforts a few thousand well-trained and dedicated Vietcong Communists have become. They know that ours is an age when force can impose an unpopular dictatorship only when it is totally overwhelming as the Soviet divisions in East Germany.

The greatest United States aid to the free Cuban movement will not come from military action against Castro. The sort of action recommended by Mr. Nixon smacks so much of Yankee imperialism that in the final analysis it could only help Castro.

The major things needed from U.S. policy are already coming forth under President Kennedy. His firm and courageous elimination of the Soviet missiles, and his subsequent actions, have prevented the Communists from turning Cuba into a satellite firmly held by Soviet might.

CLASSIC REVOLUTIONARIES

The responsibility for the final downfall of Castro lies with the people of Cuba. They are now just beginning the gathering of their forces, inside Cuba and among the exiles in the Caribbean area and on the U.S. mainland.

The young men who today are forming these revolutionary forces of freedom are not prominent on our TV screens or in our press photographs. And they are revolutionaries—in the classic sense—not merely opponents of Castro but opponents of his betrayal of the revolution which Cuba under Batista and his predecessors had so long needed.

They are gathering now, and have been for 15 months since their morale began recovering from the almost fatal defeat of the Bay of Pigs. They are resolute in their determination to see Cuba liberated by Cubans. They are not merely wary of, but in fact openly hostile toward, the sort of U.S.

A1471

A1472

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

March 18

support that would make them American satellites.

This is the dominant characteristic of the new Cuban democratic revolutionary movement. It is a characteristic which will never be understood by CIA officers who ask for promises about the future fate of the King Ranch or other U.S. investments in Cuba.

In the final analysis, these Cuban freedom forces are poised to fight the only kind of war of liberation that the free world can countenance. Their guerrilla tactics will be frankly imitative of Mao Tse-tung and Ho Chi Minh. But their political strategy will be drawn from the experience of Washington and Franklin and Jefferson. For their war will not be aimed to establish a U.S. hegemony but rather to create a new free land.

SUPPORT THAT FAILED

The extent of the determination of the Cuban liberation movement can be shown by a recent poignant example.

Still in Castro's torturing jails, untouched by any ransom effort of Mr. Donovan, are thousands of anti-Castro Cubans. A small group of anti-Communist leaders has been held together under maximum security conditions by Castro. The group, of 25 or so, is composed of men and women sentenced to prison terms averaging 30 years, and they have been tortured and starved since their arrest.

Four months ago the Cuban liberation movement inside Cuba succeeded in infiltrating the military guarding the prison, the inside prison guards and officials at a nearby landing spot. Conditions were established that gave favorable odds for the success of a smash and grab raid by a small landing force of 40 men.

All that was needed by way of outside help was a single fast ship—large enough to put 40 armed men ashore and then take aboard the 25 rescued prisoners.

Weeks were spent in attempts to get a boat. A general smuggler with anti-Castro leanings seemed close to offering an appropriate vessel. Then negotiations fell through.

The next week, the 25 suffering prisoners were moved inland to a new heavily guarded prison in the interior of Cuba. Castro regularly moves his more important prisoners as a security safeguard. The chance for rescue had passed.

PATIENT—TO A POINT

Among the prisoners, very ill and perhaps even dying, are a man and a woman each of whom is engaged to an exile leader in the United States. But even under such extreme personal stress, the liberation force leaders refused to seek out CIA aid.

"We shall have to wait," one of the exiles said recently, "even if we wait a long time. For this time Cuba must be freed by Cubans who are responsible only to their fellow Cubans. We are pledged to create democracy and self-respect where before Castro we knew only chaos and corruption—and now we have only Communist tyranny. We shall wait. But not forever. Our forces are beginning to gather. And our revolution shall succeed—a revolution for democracy but nevertheless a revolution, and not just a counterrevolution against Castro."

The young man of 38 who said this is brave. He is a well-educated professional with a graduate degree from a U.S. university. He is physically fit beyond even the rigors of a 50-mile hike. He was a leader of the underground against Batista. He supported Castro until the Communist domination became apparent. Then he headed a major part of the anti-Castro underground.

He seemed, to this observer, another impressive example of those courageous resisters of tyranny who have made up some of the best men of our times. He seemed an omen—a working, living omen—of hope for the triumph of freedom.

Missile Sites in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1963

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, these remarks upon the subject of missile sites in Alaska will supplement my remarks to this House last spring on the same subject appearing in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1962, at page A3593. At that time a rumor was afloat that the Pentagon was about to announce that a network of Minuteman missile sites would be established in Alaska. To date no such announcement has been made although:

First. Alaska is strategically located as the corridor between Asia and North America.

Second. A missile weapons system in Alaska would be much nearer to our Nation's potential enemy targets, for example, over a thousand miles closer to Russia and Red China than any location in the other States, a factor which would improve accuracy and the effectiveness of the weapons.

Third. Land is available in Alaska in the general area of all suitable locations without cost, which would allow construction upon the bedrock of American soil, so to speak, as distinguished from the political quicksand of bases and sites on foreign soil.

Fourth. Locations in Alaska are far dispersed from the great industrial centers of the United States.

Fifth. Funds spent upon the construction and maintenance of such sites in Alaska would be money spent in our own country consistent with the effort to improve our balance of payments.

Sixth. So long as the great deterrent is the power to strike back and destroy an aggressor, the military importance of Alaska must not be overlooked, a point which the Russians apparently apprehend judged from the flight last week of two of their planes over Alaska.

Seventh. Alaskans, with very few exceptions, have let it be known that, in the interest of our country as a whole, they are willing to undergo the increased risk to them which would be incident to the establishment of missile sites in the 49th State.

Consistent with the chain of events and related factors which I have just mentioned is recent action by our veterans in Alaska, as follows: A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Alaska, at Juneau, and a like resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Juneau. The body of both of these resolutions reads as follows:

MISSILE SITES IN ALASKA
RESOLUTION

Whereas it has been disclosed that a new survey of Alaska has been completed; that the feasibility of deploying missiles in this State is now under study at the Pentagon, and the Commander in Chief of the Alaskan Command has urged through official channels

the emplacement of offensive missiles in Alaska; and

Whereas the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars in Alaska have long sought a reevaluation of the military posture of this State and have urged that Alaska's strategic importance be recognized and acknowledged by the planners in the Pentagon; and

Whereas the advantages of Alaska as a missile base have repeatedly been pointed out by various news media and Members of the Congress, and are obvious to many of the military leaders in Washington and elsewhere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, In regular meeting assembled at Juneau, Alaska, that:

1. This council call on all citizens of Alaska and on all Americans everywhere to assist our elected officials in obtaining a reevaluation of the military posture in Alaska;

2. This council believes this Nation cannot afford further delay in recognizing the strategic importance of Alaska and the obvious advantages of this State as a base for offensive missile capability; and

3. The military leaders in the Pentagon be urged to approve the construction of missile-launching facilities in Alaska without further delay.

Hon. Clyde Doyle

SPEECH

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 14, 1963

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the Grim Reaper stands at our elbow as a constant reminder that this life is uncertain and fleeting and that we are never sure when the call may come to each one of us. Last Wednesday we joined with our departed colleague in the important work of this House and we saw him leave at the close of day in apparent health and strength. And then on the morrow we learned with grief and consternation of his untimely demise.

Passing this way but once it behooves all of us to have a bit more concern for the amenities as we meet, even casually, those who are our associates on this life's journey. In that particular, CLYDE DOYLE was truly one of this earth's noblemen and his qualities of greatness stem from an innate kindness and the traits of a gentleman. Our colleague and brother was a kind man, a gentle man, and withal a representative of the people who walked in the fear and admonition of the Lord.

As the vice president of our Christian fellowship group he led our meditations on occasion and demonstrated by his humble but nonetheless forceful witnessing that he had made his peace with his Maker and that his life would continue to be one of dedication in the service of the Nation and his fellow men. We who have passed through the dark valley know something of the heartbreak and anguish that now assail his loved ones and our sympathy goes out to his bereaved helpmate and the other members of his family with whom we are joined in mourning the passing of a great public servant, who was also a fine Christian gentleman.